



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,500	04/06/2001	Jane Wen Chang	11646-013001	5732
26161	7590	12/12/2003	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			EHICHOYA, FRED I	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2172		
DATE MAILED: 12/12/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/827,500	CHANG ET AL.
	Examiner Fred I. Ehichioya	Art Unit 2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 - 30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 - 30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Response to communication filed on November 14, 2003.
2. Claims 1 – 30 are pending in this office action.
3. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
4. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1 – 30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 7 – 12, 14, and 25 - 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,338,575 issued to Khan et al. (hereinafter "Khan") in view of U.S. Patent 5,970,449 issued to Fileno A. Alleva et al (hereinafter "Alleva").

Regarding claims 1, 14, 29 and 30, Khan teaches a method of accessing information comprising:

processing a query and a wireless identifier received from a wireless devices (see column 2, lines 4 – 34 and column 16, lines 25 – 29);

searching a collection of data for a set of results matching the query (see column 10, lines 44 – 50);

selectively reducing the set of results to generate a subset of results (see column 10, line 5 through column 11, line 6); and

outputting the subset of results on the wireless device (see column 10, lines 13 – 26 and column 11, lines 1 – 3).

Khan does not explicitly teach outputting a prose rendition of the query.

Alleva teaches outputting a prose rendition of the query (see Abstract and column 8, lines 33 – 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Alleva with the teaching of Khan wherein a

text normalizer normalizes text that is outputted for the query. The motivation is that normalization of the text produces text that is less awkward and more familiar to recipients of the text.

Regarding claims 7 and 25, Khan teaches selectively reducing comprises: placing the set of results in a hierarchical data structure organized by taxonomy (see column 24, lines 18 – 46); discarding results positioned at a lowest level of the hierarchical data structure (see column 23, lines 64 – 67).

Regarding claim 8, Alleva teaches outputting the prose rendition comprises: processing the query in conjunction with rules of grammar (see column 5, line 58 through column 6, line 64); and processing the query in conjunction with a prose configuration file (see Abstract and column 8, lines 33 – 38; “prose is normalization of text”).

Regarding claim 9, Khan teaches outputting of the subset comprises placing the subset in a table (see column 23, lines 4 – 9).

Regarding claim 10, Khan teaches customizing the table to the wireless device (see column 10, lines 64 - 65).

Regarding claim 11, Khan teaches customizing the table to the wireless device comprises:

loading a wireless style sheet database (see column 11, lines 1 - 3);
locating a style sheet that matches the wireless identifier in the style sheet database (see column 11, lines 3 – 6); and
reducing the length and width of the table in accordance with the style sheet (see column 10, lines 13 – 19).

Regarding claims 12 and 27, Khan teaches wherein reducing further comprises subdividing the table into a plurality of smaller tables (see column 25, lines 2 – 3).

Regarding claim 26, Khan teaches outputting the subset comprises:
placing the subset in a table ("see column 23, lines 4 – 9); and
reducing the length and width of the table in accordance with the style sheet (see column 10, lines 13 – 19).

Regarding claim 28, Khan teaches outputting the subset comprises replacing long form words in the table with corresponding abbreviations in an abbreviations database (see column 25, lines 23 – 30).

7. Claims 2 –6, 13, and 15 - 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,338,575 issued to Khan in view of Alleva and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,505,158 issued to Allstair D. Conkie (hereafter "Conkie").

Regarding claims 2 and 20, Khan and Alleva disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed in claims 1 and 14 respectively. Khan teaches processing the query comprises:

adding context to the search fragment (see column 10, lines 42 - 43).

Khan or Alleva does not explicitly teach parsing the query to generate a search fragment; substituting long form words for abbreviations contained in the search fragment in conjunction with an abbreviations dictionary.

Conkie teaches parsing the query to generate a search fragment (see column 3, line 22 and column 4, lines 65 – 67);

substituting long form words for abbreviations contained in the search fragment in conjunction with an abbreviations dictionary (see column 3, lines 34 – 41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Conkie with the teaching of Khan and Alleva wherein the words are parsed to generate the fragments. The motivation is that parsing articulates the way words or phrased are used.

Regarding claims 3 and 21, Khan teaches adding context comprises extracting data from a web page from which the query was received (see column 23, lines 58 – 60; where “extracting data from a web page” is read on “the user is then allowed to select the headline or hyperlink of his/her choice”).

Regarding claims 4 and 22, Khan teaches adding context comprises extracting data from a previously presented results page from which the query was received (see column 22, lines 53 – 59).

Regarding claims 5 and 23, Khan and Alleva disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed in claim 1 and 12 respectively.

Conkie teaches processing the query comprises:
normalizing text of the query (see column 3, lines 22 - 25);
parsing the text (see column 3, line 22);
associating long form words for abbreviations in conjunction with an abbreviations dictionary (see column 3, lines 25 - 41); and
providing meaning to the text (see column 3 lines 29 - 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Conkie with the teaching of Khan and Alleva wherein the words are parsed to generate the fragments. The motivation is that parsing articulates the way words or phrased are used.

Regarding claims 6 and 24, Conkie teaches associating context with the text (see column 4, lines 56 – 59).

Regarding claim 13, Khan and Alleva disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed in claim 10. Alleva teaches customizing the table comprises:

loading an abbreviations dictionary (see column 3, lines 48 - 52).

Khan or Alleva does not explicitly teach replacing long form words in the table with corresponding abbreviations in the abbreviations.

Conkie teaches replacing long form words in the table with corresponding abbreviations in the abbreviations (see column 3, lines 22 – 41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Conkie with the teaching of Khan and Alleva wherein the words are parsed to generate the fragments. The motivation is that parsing articulates the way words or phrased are used.

Regarding claim 15, Conkie teaches the query is a combination of text, sentence fragments and abbreviated words (see column 3, lines 20 - 67).

Regarding claim 16, Conkie teaches the query is text (see column 3, lines 24 - 25).

Regarding claim 17, Conkie teaches the query is sentence fragments (see column 4, line 4).

Regarding claim 18, Conkie teaches the query is abbreviated words (see column 3, lines 22 - 25).

Regarding claim 19, Conkie teaches the query is speech (see column 2, lines 4 - 6).

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred I. Ehichioya whose telephone number is 703-305-8039. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-303-3900.

Fred I. Ehichioya
Examiner
Art Unit 2172
December 3, 2003



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100